India

FOR THE

No. 199. New Series.]
No. 298. Old Series.]
WEEK ENDING FRIDAY, OCTOBER 25, 1901.
[Registered as a Newspaper.] Price...... 2d. By Post, 2½d.

Notes and News 193
Indians in the Colonies 196
Our London Letter 197
Notes from Bombay 198
Chronicle of the Week 198
British Rule in India: Mr. Naoroji at Brixton 200
The "Drain" from India 201
Locomotives for India 201
The Famine in India: 254,000 Persons on Relief 202
The Dismissal of Mr. Pennell ... 202
Advertisements 204

NOTES AND NEWS.

AMONG the recent signatories of the Indian Famine Union's Memorial are Lord Wrottesley, Sir George Birdwood, Sir W. Bruce, Sir Robert Head, Mr. J. Knox Wight, Mr. W. Martin Wood, Sir Michael Foster, M.P., Mr. J. Keir Hardie, M.P., Mr. T. W. Nussey, M.P., Mr. D. V. Pirie, M.P., Mr. S. Forde Ridley, M.P., Mr. Fielding Johnston, Rev. Vernon Staley, the Chairman of Cambridgeshire County Council, the Chairman of Merionethshire County Council, and the Mayor of Gloucester.

Mr. W. Digby, C.I.E., sends us some interesting particulars regarding the volume, "'Prosperous' British India, a Revelation from Official Records," which Mr. Fisher Unwin will shortly publish for him. It is described as "a new book on India, the greatest problem of the British Empire." We take the following from a printed description of the scope and purpose of the book:—

> A complete Agricultural and Industrial Survey of the Country, so that stock may be taken as to the actual state of the people (which is what India needs before all else), is a pressing duty which the authorities, both in India and in England, have carefully abstained from performing. The late Sir Louis Mallet, Permanent Under-Secretary of State for India, placed it on record that he met with "vehement opposition" from the Secretary of State's Council when he urged such a survey should be undertaken. This was in 1875. Nothing has been done since then. The opposition to its being done is as vehement now as it was then. Mr. Digby, depending wholly upon official records of every kind, attempts such a survey in outline, with here and there a profusion of detail. In connexion with the North-Western Provinces and Oudh, the Punjab, Bombay, and the Territories specially under the control of the Government of India itself, he furnishes startling particulars (from unpublished Government Records) which he has arranged with Mr. Charles Booth's studies on London economic conditions in mind.

The book is to contain a good index, three maps, and twenty "diagrammatic and other sketches." Very striking indeed these sketches are, to judge from the specimens.

The Indore Famine Report has provoked considerable controversy in the Press. Its author, Mr. Nanak Chand, Minister to the Maharaja of Indore, is indeed unusually outspoken for one in his position. He accounts for the small reserve power of resistance with which the famine was met by the great increase that had taken place in the land revenue. Under the late Maharaja hundreds of wells and tanks were constructed, and as a result the revenue rose from 22 to 67 lakhs. These wells and tanks have now fallen out of repair, but the revenue has not been concurrently reduced. The rayat has to pay the full assessment of irrigated fields on fields which are no longer irrigated. This, of course, is indefensible, but a Prince who sees the land revenue in British India rising at every assessment, and who is taught that the highest political wisdom consists in more and more adopting the methods of administration employed by the paramount power, may be excused if he shows some reluctance largely to reduce revenue. It is to his credit that in the hard school of famine that reluctance seems to have been overcome.

It is also urged by the critics of the Indore administration that relief works were only started after a criminal delay. The Report gives little countenance to this charge. Indore had been long free from famine, and the serious calamity impending was only recognised at the end of August, when two grain stores were looted. After that, however, there was no delay, for early in September two-and-a-half lakhs were set aside for relief. Altogether more than 50 lakhs were spent in one year. The "Indian Spectator," which takes a favourable view of the work done in Indore, says that it "seems to have been free from undue stringency on the one hand and indiscriminate alms-giving on the other." One important point is that when the distress became general, "half of the revenue demand, amounting to about twenty-nine lakhs and a half, was suspended, and orders were issued to the Mahal authorities to use no harshness in collecting the other half." This reduced the revenue to only 20 per cent. of the usual demand.

In the course of some stimulating reflections on the anniversary of Trafalgar the "Times" wrote in its first leading article on Monday:—

> "We have forty million reasons for failure, but not a single excuse"—that is, we do not as a nation take education seriously, we have no effective belief in the saving power of knowledge. "The great defect of England at present," said the late Bishop of London in that undelivered address which Lord Rosebery commended so highly and so justly at Birmingham, "is an inadequate conception of the value of knowledge in itself and of its importance for the national life." In like manner Sir John Gorst tells us that technical education is of little avail unless it falls on an instructed mind, on an intelligence prepared for its reception. That is just the point. Our general education, such as it is, is neither scientific, sincere, nor thorough, and when technical education comes to be superposed upon it, it lacks solidity because the foundation is insecure.

The passage may be commended to the attention of those reactionaries in India who are seeking to employ technical instruction as a means of prejudicing secondary and higher education.

The Maharaja Scindia has already won well deserved honour by two successful experiments in education. Some few years ago he opened the first State schools in Gwalior for girls, and there are now two large and flourishing institutions as well as several smaller ones. He then set up a school for young sardars, which already gives good promise of success. He is now about to deal with a still harder problem, the education of the daughters of his nobles, who, after reaching marriageable age, are kept in strict seclusion. He proposes to collect the girls before the age of seclusion and form a small school. According to the "Pioneer," they are to be under a European lady, assisted by one or two pandits, and are to be taught in their native Marathi. It is to be hoped that the European lady will remember that it is in India that the lives of her pupils will have to be passed, and that the duties of an Indian household are those that lie before them.

The "Pioneer," in dealing with the last Bengal Police Report, says "though the Lieutenant-Governor's comments upon it are couched in that studiously moderate language which Sir John Woodburn always endeavours to employ, it is not difficult to read between the lines his grave dissatisfaction with the present condition of things." There seems, indeed, good reason for this dissatisfaction. The total of cognisable crime was higher than in any year of the decade except 1897, and the percentage of convictions to cases is lower than at any time during the last eight years. Of stolen property only 15 per cent. has been recovered. The prevention of riot leaves much to be desired. Cases of murder and grievous hurt have been steadily increasing in number for four years, and to take all serious offences against persons, only 32 per cent. of the cases reported ended in convictions.

On one side, indeed, the police receive a certain amount of negative praise. Only four cases of torture were proved against them, though there were many charges of extortion. But the investigations into petty charges of theft and burglary, in which the time of the force was chiefly spent, give opportunities, as the "Pioneer" says, "for petty tyranny to which there is scarcely a limit." In Patna there were 1,324 burglaries in which no property was taken; all were investigated; and there were 17 convictions. In the whole Province, out of 14,773 burglaries of this kind, 12,226 were investigated, with only 453 convictions. Similarly of cases of theft under one rupee investigated, only about half resulted in convictions. Now these abortive investigations into trivial crimes obviously give vast opportunities for petty tyranny. The Government, indeed, condemns them as a burden and vexation alike to police and people. On the whole, it seems that the police in India combine the corruption of the old Native rule with a power and an omnipresence such as was formerly impossible. The need for reform is urgent.

The Bishop of Calcutta has good warrant for magnifying his office before the Brighton Church Congress. "Every sixth child, if not every fifth child, born into the world," he has discovered, "lives within the province of the Metropolitan of India and Ceylon." And he cannot think "of any event, or of any event conceivable as happening within such time as in the history of religion may be called moderate, which would so vastly change the moral and spiritual aspect of the world as the conversion of India to Christianity." Nothing less than this is "the Church in India, as a spiritual power," responsible for. It is a big job, clearly; "difficult," but "not hopeless." Dr. Welldon spent 545 days in India before he saw a snake out of captivity; he has not seen another yet. Some cynical people say much the same of Indian Christians. Dr. Welldon's answer is: they "have not looked in the right place." The Census Report says there is an increase of 32.6 per cent. in the number of Christians during the past ten years. But Dr. Welldon does not give the total. "Were it possible," he says, "to flood India with thousands of missionaries, a great impression could, I think, be made within a reasonable time upon its vast population." Indians, to be sure, are always ready to give exotic opinions a courteous hearing; but the heroic remedy of "thousands of missionaries" would, we suspect, raise questions that Dr. Welldon could not lay. Really, is it not time for the Bishop of Calcutta to approach Indian spiritual beliefs from the inside (if he can), or at least to consider seriously whether or not the purposes of the Supreme Being are limited to the ideas of the Church of England?

Mr. Romesh Dutt has arranged to address meetings at Mansfield House, Canning Town, London (October 27), on "Indian Agriculture"; at Richmond Athenæum (November 17) on "India of To-day"; and at Tunbridge Wells (November 24) on "India Present and Future."

The Simla correspondent of the "Times" (October 20) reports the passing of the North-Western Provinces and Oudh Tenancy Bill by the Provincial Legislative Council at Allahabad. The Bill has been before the province for some three years, and of course has evoked much opposition, though Sir Antony MacDonnell "confidently asserted that no Bill of such magnitude and dealing with such a subject has evoked less real opposition." This he attributed to "the fact that there has been from the beginning no concealment of our intentions and objects." Sir Antony's further explanation is worth serious attention:—

> We have from the outset taken the landlords and the people into our confidence by frank and open conferences and discussions, and have sought to make the Bill useful and acceptable to all concerned. This frankness has, to my own knowledge, disarmed much opposition and confirmed many landlords in their antecedent belief that the Government, which had stood by them in their hour of need, would not knowingly injure them in their dignity or property. The Bill, I can well believe, is not acceptable to the new-fledged zemindar, who deals with his tenants on commercial principles; but as regards the old territorial aristocracy of the country it will only confirm existing practice when it is not needed to reclaim that practice from evil ways which take no heed of the fact that the rayat is also of flesh and blood and has feelings and passions which, if overstrained, lead to results which are unpleasant for landlord and Government alike.

Three of the six Native members dissented. The principal reasons urged by them appear to have been: that the Bill was calculated to increase the antagonism between landlord and tenant, so as to lead to the discontinuance of concessions hitherto made to tenants and to swell the volume of litigation, and that "its injurious provisions would strike at the root of time-honoured rights and customs, and result in deteriorating the value of landed property in general." Some of the amendments are said to have been "proposed under a misapprehension as to the real meaning of the clauses of the Bill."

The retrospective operation of certain of the provisions seems rather a strong step, and its justification must depend upon the particular facts, which are not before us. Sir Antony, however, "stated that this was most essential, as a certain class of landlords had been granting leases, since the Bill was published, which were designed to neutralise its provisions and render void some of the advantages proposed to be conferred upon tenants." He said:—

> The conditions with which we are dealing are these. A tenant has held land for seven years. He has presumably spent his money on it, is willing to pay a fair enhancement of rent, and is threatened with ejectment because he will not pay an exorbitant enhancement. In dealing with this great question the interests of the landlords, great though I allow them to be, are not the only interests to be considered. We in this Council have to consider also the interests of the country at large, of the vast mass of the population, and of the Government, which has to maintain law and order and do what it can to promote the general prosperity. It would be hurtful to the general community and destructive of progressive agriculture if every seven years there was to be a dislocation of holdings because, forsooth, exorbitant demands for rent were not at once complied with. By all means let enhancement of rents be demanded, but if the fairness of the demand is disputed by tenants anxious to remain on their holdings, to pay a fair rent, to support their families, and to support the Government, whose foundations they are, then I say, live and let live. Let there be equity and fairness in the adjudication of what the fair rent may be. All that this Bill provides in this connexion is that, when a landlord desires to eject a tenant who has held his land for seven years because the tenant questions the fairness of the rent enhancement demanded, that question shall be submitted to the arbitrament of an impartial tribunal. If the question be not one of rent enhancement; if the landlord desires to eject the tenant as unsuitable or because he wishes himself to resume the land, there is nothing in this Bill which prevents him from ejecting the tenant and resuming possession of the land. . . . . The benefits which the Bill confers on the zemindars are great and manifest. It is not a one-sided Bill, as it would be if the objections raised to it had prevailed. While it seeks to help the rayat it also helps the landlord. The simplification of procedure and the reduction of the expenses of litigation are a more effectual safeguard against the transfer of the rayat's rights. These and other provisions are great benefits conferred on landholders.

Now, there can be no possible question that this standpoint is the right one: the general prosperity of the community. It is the general interest that must govern the policy of legislation; and in the long run the dissentient landlords may find their greater advantage in the better conditions of their tenants. The more instructed of them will see this at once; the less instructed must be taught by experience. The Act, however, like the rest of the current land legislation, can be regarded only as a temporary alleviation; for, we cannot but think, it is only a provisional tinkering of symptoms, and not a remedy that eradicates the agrarian disease.

Mr. H. G. Keene, C.I.E., whose previous works on the history of India are well known, has just published a very interesting little volume called "The Great Anarchy, or Darkness before Dawn" (W. Thacker and Co.), consisting of "sketches of military adventure in Hindustan during the period immediately preceding British occupation." Sir Richard Temple supplies a cordial and suggestive preface. But neither Mr. Keene nor Sir Richard, so far as we have observed, makes mention of Mr. Herbert Compton's excellent volume giving "a particular account of the European Military Adventurers of Hindustan from 1784 to 1803," and setting out at great length the story of De Boigne, George Thomas, and Perron, with shorter notices of many others. Still, Mr. Keene has supplied some fresh material, and he has treated his adventurers in close relation with the political and social conditions of the period, which gives his sketch a distinctive raison d'être. "The general effect, down to the time when the servants of the company appeared in Hindustan, is that of hardly-mitigated anarchy," and provides Mr. Keene with an effective back-

ground for contrast with "the benefits the peoples of India have received from the assumption of Indian administration by a Western race."

Mr. Keene points out that "India is not, generally speaking, 'a conquered country'." The new-comers, assuming the controlling power that had passed from the broken-down Moghul Empire into the hands of incompetent Princes, "founded their rule upon an inarticulate 'plebiscitum,' expressed by silence, but none the less understood to be conditioned on faith and justice to be observed by them." While "an immigrant dominion can be preserved only by constant renewal of immigration," still this by no means implies "that Native talent is not to be encouraged, or Native valour and loyalty to be trusted," and "we ought surely to remember that some among the very greatest Indian administrators and statesmen have always been Natives of India." Though not agreeing at all points with Mr. Keene's criticism of Dalhousie, we think he comes nearer to the truth than Sir Richard Temple will admit. It is curious to find Mr. Keene excluding the "civil law, which in most respects follows the religious codes of Hinduism or of Islam," administered by our officials in India, from "the rules of civilised polity." And this is a sufficiently remarkable statement:—

> Nothing can be more unfair than the assertion of some of our would-be reformers to the effect that the people of India are suffering under a crushing weight of taxes. That is, indeed, the exact reverse of what is happening; and it is the difficulty of taxing such a population that forms the preliminary—the insurmountable—objection to forcing upon them an exotic civilisation, if that were otherwise shown to be right and proper. A revenue that is collected in copper is called upon to maintain up-to-date institutions of war and peace; and the inevitable result is tending to make of British rule in India a permanent catastrophe.

But, in any case, the taxes would surely be lighter if the enormous military expenditure were less, and if the forcing process of railway-building and other public works beyond immediate necessities were reduced to limits dictated by the condition of the country and not by extrinsic considerations.

An Anglo-Indian writes:—To the general reader, also to public men with short memories, the copious histories of the career of H.H. Abdur Rahman so promptly given by our daily press, must have come quite as a boon, and if preserved will be appreciated as a permanent benefit. For few sections of political history are more obscure than those relating to events that have occurred just within or a few years beyond any current generation. Take for instance the circumstances under which Abdur Rahman accepted the throne at Kabul as Amir of the whole of Afghanistan; and the form in which the memorable episode was dealt with in the demi-official narratives published three weeks ago by the "Standard" and the "Times." In the former journal this political event is dealt with in the passage beginning—"At last his [Abdur Rahman's] long sought opportunity came," the bare fact being thus baldly stated—"In May, 1880, the Indian authorities made him a formal offer of the Amirship; and, after some delay, it was accepted." The "Times" account of the transaction is more fully, but less frankly, described in the passage that opens with the sentence—"Abdur Rahman's chance came in 1879, when the massacre of the British envoy, Sir Louis Cavagnari and his companions, led to the removal of Yakub Khan, who had succeeded Shere Ali." Those who have read these and similar passages in the "inspired" histories of Abdur Rahman's accession may well have adopted some such superficial opinion as that the formal offer by "the Indian authorities"—that is the Simla Political Department through Sir Frederick Roberts and Sir Lepel Griffin—was a spontaneously generous action on our part, for which, and not to the adverse circumstances in which our commanders found themselves, Abdur Rahman was under infinite obligation. But those who will look up the true history of that occurrence, since become so notable in its sequence and its results, will find that the debt of obligation was all the other way, and that the then ragged returned political exile really rescued the Indian Government from most serious military and political embarrassment.

That painful situation into which the foolish Salisbury-Lytton policy and disastrous invasion of Afghanistan had drifted us, is mildly described in this sentence of the "Times" narrative—"At that time we were most anxious to terminate our occupation of Kabul; and then withdraw our troops to India." The handiest reference we can give to this forgotten page of history is to the late Mr. Dacosta's little book: "A Scientific Frontier" (W. H. Allen and Co., 1891), pp. 83-8. These passages are mainly founded on Mr. Hensman's excellent journal-letter, as special correspondent of the "Pioneer." This one compendious passage, under date of June 4, 1880, serves to confirm all that is said, and more that is suggested in our above remarks—"Kabul has indeed proved a white elephant . . . we are so anxious to get rid of the beast that we are thrusting it as a gift upon a man who looks upon it as his lawful property which we have seriously injured." If those few readers of the newspapers who care to know the truth about modern Indian history will compare this and similar passages that follow they will see that this testimony of a trusted eye-witness on the spot serves to sweep away much of the gloss ingeniously insinuated into the demi-official statement regarding the turning point in Abdur Rahman's career. However, that is a long time ago. The late Amir did his rough duty well, and H.H. Habibulla "the well-beloved" reigns in his stead, and even Russophobists are happy.

A correspondent of the "Times" (October 19), veiling his identity under the letter "C," explains the point of Russia's policy in the south of Persia. The scheme, he says, was sketched out more than 20 years ago "by one of Russia's greatest strategists and politicians," and he adds that he believes he is right in saying that a copy of it is now in our Foreign Office. Well, of course, the ultimate object of Russia is to get to Constantinople, and "the object of coming down on the Persian Gulf is to force the hand of Great Britain and secure the certainty of the advance on the Bosporus later on."

> Either Russia emerges on the Persian Gulf and obtains a harbour there and control of all Southern Persia and its confines, while offering Great Britain an issue which must be damaging to her power and prestige in the eyes of all Eastern races; or else Great Britain must tacitly assent to the slow but certain progress of Russia to the Bosporus.

There are the two horns of the dilemma. Whichever is preferred, "continuity is the essence of the game." Russia, at all events, is continuous, as well as patient. There is much reason in Russia's desire for a southern outlet, and we should hesitate to place much weight on the argument of damage to our power and prestige in the eyes of Eastern races. However, it is for the Government to take a line of policy on the facts of the case, and to adhere to it continuously. Nothing is worse than drift.

It is a common Anglo-Indian argument that Mahomedans and Hindus are deadly enemies, and that were either in power none of the other religion would be admitted to office. It might be thought that such historic examples as Akbar, in whose reign Hindus reached the highest posts, would be sufficient to explode this absurdity. But the answer is that Akbar lived a long time ago. This answer, however, will not do for Hyderabad, where the Nizam, the greatest Mahomedan Prince in India, has just chosen as his Prime Minister Raja Krishna Prasad, a Hindu. This, indeed, is nothing new, but as the latest instance, it may improve the existing relations between Hindus and Moslems throughout India. Both communities should remember that by their distrust of each other, where it exists, they play into the hands of those who rule by their divisions, and by exaggerating their differences, seek to prolong their own monopoly of the high offices of State.

Remittances on India for 50 lakhs were on Wednesday offered for tender by the India Council, and applications amounting to Rs.13,09,45,000 were received at prices ranging from 1s. 3d. and 31-32nds to 1s. 4d. and 1-32nd. The following amounts were allotted, viz., in bills: Rs.25,32,000 on Calcutta at an average of 1s. 3.969d.; Rs.5,69,000 on Bombay at an average of 1s. 3.981d.; and Rs.15,99,000 on Madras at an average of 1s. 3.986d.; and in telegraphic transfers three lakhs on Calcutta at an average of 1s. 4.031d. Tenders for bills at 1s. 3d. and 31-32nds will receive about 2 per cent., and for transfers at 1s. 4d. and 1-32nd in full. Last week remittances for Rs.60,20,000 were sold for £400,820, making the total disposed of from April 1 to Tuesday night Rs.10,83,63,987, producing £7,196,375. Next week 50 lakhs will again be offered.

INDIANS IN THE COLONIES.

A DEBT OF HONOUR.

THE other day (October 14) there was despatched to the English newspapers, from the Cape, a telegram which, in some instances at least, was headed "Alarm at Cape Town." One not unnaturally imagined that the cause of such alarm would probably be some development in the applications of "martial law," or, at the worst, some immediate danger of Boer invasion. The real cause, however, turned out to be an invasion of a somewhat different character—an invasion of peaceable, cleanly, industrious, and thrifty fellow-citizens—a "huge influx into Cape Colony of poor Indians whom the Natal Government has refused to allow to land at Durban." The arrival of these Indians appears to have produced such a commotion in the breasts of the "Loyalist" traders of Cape Town that they incontinently convened a meeting of the Chamber of Commerce to give vent to their outraged commercial feelings. "Several speakers," we are told, "expressed great indignation." No wonder, in a part of the British Empire where Imperialism is identified with parochialism, and the Imperial flag is regarded as an "asset." But what was to be done? The Cape Parliament had neglected to pass Acts, as Natal has done, to protect the "Loyalist" white against the onset of dusky competition; and now the machinery of legislation is in abeyance. "The Chamber," we learn, "finally resolved to approach the authorities, both civil and military, with a view to prompt action being taken to check the influx of coloured immigrants."

We do not quite understand what the civil authorities can do in the matter. We thought they were hiding their diminished heads under a reign of martial "law." Still, some of our Colonial brethren seem to be able to reconcile conditions that the less elastic intelligences of the old country fail to conceive as other than antagonistic and mutually exclusive. Nor do we anticipate that even the youngest and least prudent of military authorities will proceed to hang or shoot the whole invasive cargo out of hand. We do not profess even to understand why the Natal Government refused to allow the Indians to land at Durban. The reason alleged in the telegram is: "Owing to their presence being considered prejudicial to the supply of desirable white immigrants": but this, we take it, is not a legally sufficient reason. The Natal laws lay down explicit conditions of entry, and we should like to know which of these conditions the intending immigrants failed to satisfy. The only tangible point seems to be indicated by the word "poor"—"the 'poor' Indians." Leaving this matter for further enquiry, we observe with satisfaction that even the "Cape Argus," while deprecating an unrestricted influx of British Indians, warns the colonists that they may have to revise many of their notions on this question in consequence of certain incidents of the war. According to a telegram from the Cape Town correspondent of the "Times" (October 11), the "Argus" said:—

> The British championship of Indian grievances was one of the objects of the war. The Indians have helped us with all that was in their power. Many of those objected to have lately been, or actually are, in the British military service, though in a humble capacity. Some Indians are among the most respectable inhabitants of Cape Town.

These four opportune sentences contain not a little matter for political consideration. Is the rod to beat our Indian fellow-subjects at the Cape to be enlarged, after a war "of liberation," from the thickness of President Kruger's thumb to the girth of Mr. Chamberlain's loins? Are the Indians that "have helped us with all that was in their power" to see their countrymen shut out as "undesirables," and to hear the door banged in their face? Is this likely to be an encouragement or a ground for gratitude in the minds of those that "have lately been, or actually are, in the British military service," or is our sense of justice and humanity so brutalised that we may ignore their feelings merely because they have served us, or are serving us, "in a humble capacity"? Has Cape Town so many "most respectable inhabitants" that it does not want any more? When one remembers how Natal itself did honour to the Indian stretcher-bearers and to the Indian miner who so gallantly signalled to the besieged in Ladysmith, one cannot resist an intolerable sense of disgust at this fresh outbreak of petty and parochial persecution by men that flaunt their Loyalty and Imperialism.

We turn, therefore, to the Government at home, and we ask once more what it is doing for the interests of our fellow subjects, the British Indians in South Africa, at the close of the war. Or, if the war, or "a sort of warfare," is to go on indefinitely, what is it going to do in the meantime? The Cape Town traders have thrown down their challenge: it is for the home Government to take it up. Roughly speaking, there are three sets of cases. First, there is the case of the Indian refugees from the Transvaal and the Orange River Colony. The complaint of these is that they are not allowed to return to their businesses on an equal footing with white men. White men are permitted to go back; dusky faces are peremptorily refused permission. There is an unjust discrimination against a class, and it is a racial discrimination, void of sense as well as justice. Secondly, there is the case of the British Indians that actually are in the Transvaal and the Orange River Colony. The laws and regulations in force before the war, against which we appealed in strong terms to President Kruger, have been allowed to remain in operation. But there is a material practical difference. Under the Republican Governments these laws and regulations were administered with a certain rough discrimination: against the more respectable of the Indian traders they were very slackly enforced, or even left in abeyance. But now, under British administration, they are enforced with military precision, and the last state of the British Indians in these parts is worse than the first. And, thirdly, there is the general position of British Indians in our South African colonies, and indeed in other British colonies besides South Africa. It is this last case that is brought sharply before us by the action of Natal and of the Cape traders on the present occasion—and, we may add, by the Immigration Bill that has for some time been under discussion in the Federal Parliament of Australia. As the "Cape Argus" reminds the Cape colonists, the war cannot leave the British Indians in South Africa as it found them.

Again, then, we ask: What is doing? What is to be done? On July 18, Mr. Chamberlain said in reply to a question by Sir M. M. Bhownaggree (INDIA, vol. xvi, p. 46) as to the representation, dated April 20, 1901, signed by a number of British Indian trading firms and residents in South Africa complaining of the Boer regulations still enforced by the British officials in the annexed Republics:—

> The representation has been brought to my notice by my hon. friend, and I am making enquiry in regard to the allegations contained in it. The status of his Majesty's Indian subjects in the Transvaal and Orange River Colony is a matter of considerable complexity which, I fear, cannot be settled by a simple repeal of the laws of the late Republics on the subject. I have been obliged to reserve it for consideration after Lord Milner's return to South Africa, but I may add that both Lord Milner and myself will approach in a sympathetic spirit any proved grievances of our Indian fellow-subjects in the new colonies.

It is to be remembered that before the war the goal of British policy was loudly declared to be "equal rights for all civilised races in South Africa"; but the discovery of the "loyalist" objection to Indians (except as "hewers of wood and drawers of water"—and as heroic stretcher-bearers and Ladysmith signallers, so long as they saved white skins) soon corrected the expression into "equal rights for all the white races." It was the fine flower of this local prejudice, no doubt, that induced Mr. Chamberlain to wait for the arrival of Lord Milner, fresh with local colour. Now he has seen Lord Milner and conferred with Lord Milner, and Lord Milner has gone back to South Africa. What, then, is the upshot of the conference? Mr. Chamberlain was keen in his protests to President Kruger: he even pressed him to see that a relaxation of severity would be for the benefit of his own people. Now, for some time, he has had what is called a "clean slate," and we should like to know what he has written on it. We should expect that he has written, or is writing, on it certainly not less favourable terms for the Indians than those he pressed on President Kruger. And it is extremely important that he should lay down—and lay down promptly—satisfactory rules; for he has in his hands the first, or at any rate the best, opportunity he has had of showing to the other colonies, within an area where he is unfettered, what line they are expected to adopt in this serious problem of Imperialism. We see no excuse in the "complexity" of the question. The simple point is whether or not British In-

dians are to be harassed and chivied and despised in British colonies by their fellow-subjects.

Our appeal goes farther. We ask: What is the India Office doing? The India Office, apart from general duty, is paid to look after the interests of Indians, and it knows very well the danger of reflex influences on India itself. Has Lord George Hamilton made representations? If so, what are they? and where are they? He ought to have been fighting in this cause inside and outside the Cabinet. Where, we ask, is the slightest sign of his action? Again, we ask: What is being done by those who, in the days before the war, were ardent to use this Indian question as a lever to move British opinion against President Kruger? We quote from a leading article of the "Times" (September 2, 1899):—

> Though the extension of political rights, even in a limited way, to the Uitlanders may in the long run bring about the removal of their grievances, there are matters in which the Uitlanders are less directly interested but in which the paramount Power is concerned that would probably remain unaffected by any change in that direction. Such are, for instance . . . . the rights of the Anglo-Indian subjects of the Crown in the Transvaal. It was never proposed to renounce these duties in consideration of the improvement of the electoral law of the South African Republic.

The "rights of the Anglo-Indian subjects of the Crown in the Transvaal" were useful as a make-weight when our diplomacy was raising its terms after President Kruger had yielded concessions that threatened to close the dispute. But where are they now? Why does the "Times" not champion these British Indians now? Further, we ask: What is being done by those who, after the outbreak of the war, attempted to justify it to audiences in this country by impassioned reference to the Boer treatment of the Indians? Lord Lansdowne—a former Viceroy of India—made great play with this argument. Is his blood still boiling at the injustices heaped upon the Indians? Has he ever said a syllable against the continuance of these very injustices in an exaggerated degree under British administration? If so, when and where? And if not, why not? And the same questions must be put to the whole of the Tory press, which re-echoed his complaint in their efforts to inflame passion and to compass war. And, lastly, we ask: What is the Liberal party doing in the matter. To the Liberal leaders in particular we look for some clear pronouncement, and hitherto we have looked in vain. Is our vaunted Imperialism absolutely non-existent, except as a popular cry and a boast of self-glorification?

OUR LONDON LETTER.

Westminster, Thursday.

A great sensation has been caused by the supercession of Sir Redvers Buller from the command at Aldershot and his compulsory retirement on half-pay. The reason officially offered for this public humiliation of one of the most distinguished soldiers in Europe is that General Buller offended against the Army Regulations by delivering an indiscreet speech. Needless to say, the excuse is generally regarded as altogether too flimsy. Even those who applaud the action of the War Office make no secret of their conviction that the Government have simply yielded to the clamour that was raised in certain quarters against Sir Redvers Buller's appointment days before that unfortunate soldier had thought of retaliating. The miserable episode, therefore, must be regarded as one more illustration of the indecision and cowardice of the flabbiest Ministry that has ever misgoverned England. Mr. Brodrick had full knowledge of Sir Redvers Buller's shortcomings when he appointed him, but rather than stand the brunt of criticism for his administrative proceedings he throws his nominee to the wolves the moment they begin to yelp.

South Africa is, indeed, the grave of great reputations. Lord Roberts and General French alone seem to have emerged unscathed from the ordeal, but there are many who think that posterity will pass a severer judgment on the former than has been recorded in contemporary history in the case of any of his disgraced subordinates. Englishmen are sick of the sacrifices of life, money and honour that have been heaped up during the last two years on the altar of Mr. Chamberlain's God of Battles. The national pride has been grievously wounded, and if the country is still determined on the conquest of the Boers its feeling is undoubtedly inspired more by a desperate hope of retrieving past disgraces than by enthusiasm for the cause itself.

Though the King has no intention, so far as is known, of reviving George I.'s obsolete theory of personal government, there can be no doubt that his Majesty means to insist on the Royal right of administrative supervision. There is just a touch of comedy in the transformation wrought this week by King Edward's return to London. Last week, Downing Street was deserted; to-day it is as busy as a beehive. Our absentee Premier came hurrying back from Beaulieu hard on the heels of his Majesty. Other Ministers have followed their chief's example, and it is even hinted that the Cabinet will shortly resume its meetings and the direction of the country's affairs. Whether that will be a good or a bad thing for the country remains to be seen. Mr. Gibson Bowles thinks it would be quite a good thing, if only the King could be induced to preside over the Cabinet Council. Such a proposal, coming from so ardent a Constitutionalist as the member for King's Lynn, is at once a portent and a disillusion. English monarchs have abstained from meddling in Cabinet affairs for the last two centuries, and their abstention as everyone admits has added both to the strength of the throne and the well-being of the State.

Politicians are now in the thick of the autumnal fray. Elections are pending in two constituencies in Ireland and one in England, but apart from some slight stir caused by the selection of an Irish ex-officer of the Boer army as the Nationalist candidate for Galway, there has so far been little sign of public interest in the coming contests. Broader issues are agitating the popular mind—the issues of peace and war in South Africa, the administration of affairs at home, and the threatened supremacy of British commerce. A dismal feature of the situation is the settled pessimism with which people of all classes view the outlook. Everyone rails against the incapacity of the present Government, and yet it is generally admitted that their opponents are too disunited to be capable of offering the country an alternative administration. Possibly, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman may have something to say on this subject in his speech to-morrow night at Stirling. Mr. Chamberlain speaks on the same evening at Glasgow. He may be trusted to excuse the shortcomings of himself and his colleagues by showing how much worse the others would be if only they were in the same mess.

De Wet, the redoubtable Boer leader, is reported to be dead. The report may not be true, but in any event one welcomes it if only as a deviation from the monotony of those earlier reports which kept informing us that he was cornered, or hemmed in, or surrounded, or rounded up, or headed off. An evening paper, satirising the optimism which at one period of the war seemed to be invincible, has lately taken to reproducing the egregious comments of the "Times" on the "end of the campaign" exactly two years ago. Those complacent moralisings on the crushing effect of the so-called victories of Glencoe and Elandslaagte in October 1899 are unpleasant, if salutary, anniversary readings. For another taste of the same kind of bitter humour one has only to turn to the pages of a well-known year-book, published last January, and glance at the history of the war which is there entitled, with unintentional irony, "The Recent Campaign in South Africa."

Plain mortals may think the time scarcely opportune for the creation of new ribbons and decorations, but it must be remembered that this is one of the traditional methods of commemorating a Coronation. It is said that the King is contemplating the inauguration of a new military order to be conferred for service in India, most of the existing decorations associated with that country—so it is suggested—being reserved for the benefit of distinguished civilians. Another decoration that military men would like to see established is one that has been christened ere born—an Empire Cross after the fashion of the Iron Cross of Prussia. This would be bestowed, like the Victoria Cross, for valour, but the proposal is that the power of granting it should be vested in any general officer commanding on the field of battle, and that even a captain should have the right to recommend a subordinate for the distinction. A defect of the Victoria Cross is that it is scarcely open to be won by senior officers.

As President Roosevelt has lately been criticised with extraordinary vehemence for entertaining a distinguished negro at the White House, it may be of interest to recall

some words written by the unrepentant culprit as long ago as 1891. "It is noteworthy," Mr. Roosevelt wrote, "that the most bitter opponents of negro suffrage were the very men who most ceaselessly championed universal suffrage for all white citizens, no matter how poor and ignorant. The white mob which detested the white 'aristocrats' and believed in the most absolute democracy among the whites themselves, clamoured loudly against the blacks, and favoured the establishment of aristocratic and inferior castes separated by a colour line. The conduct of the popular party towards the negroes was the reverse of creditable." This was Mr. Roosevelt's judgment, as expressed in the book which he contributed to the late Professor Freeman's "Historic Towns" series, and now that the author is President, he is clearly of the same mind still. The coloured American citizens, of whom so many are now sojourning in London, are naturally enough loud in their praises of their eminent champion.

Some important judicial changes mark the re-opening today of the Law Courts. The Master of the Rolls, Sir A. L. Smith, resigned that distinguished post a few days ago and just survived his resignation long enough to see his successor appointed in Lord Justice Henn Collins. Two additional promotions are those of Mr. Justice Mathew to the Court of Appeal, and of Mr. Joseph Walton to the consequent vacancy in the King's Bench division. Mr. Justice Day, who has just retired from the bench, once enjoyed the distinction of being described in the House of Commons by Mr. John Morley—only, however, as the medium of another rhetorical artist—as "a man of the seventeenth century, a Catholic as strong as Torquemada, and a Tory of the old high-flyer and non-juror type." The portrait, whether intended to be complimentary or otherwise, was certainly faithful.

Bishop Welldon's name is again mentioned in connexion with an English bishopric. It may be remembered that rumour nominated him some months ago as successor to the late Bishop of London, and as rumour proved false on that occasion she may again be a misleading prophet. This time the diocese is that of Worcester, Dr. Perowne, the present bishop, having notified the Primate that he is about to send in his resignation. Dr. Welldon is said to be still in rather poor health, and it is not expected that he will be able to return to Calcutta for some time. Doubtless, he would not be unwilling to remain in England. Should he be appointed to the see of Worcester, that diocese will be in the position of having had two Anglo-Indian bishops in succession. Dr. Perowne, it is true, never worked in India, but he was born in Bengal.

NOTES FROM BOMBAY.

THE THIRD FAMINE.

THE IRRIGATION COMMISSION.

[From an Indian Correspondent.]

Bombay, October 5.

The monsoon is at an end, but it has left us no better than last year. For the third time there is a famine in Gujerat and Kathiawar, and there is every reason to fear that by February next even drinking-water will be sorely needed. Many of the tanks and wells in Gujerat are already at a low water mark, and it is apprehended that as the season advances and summer is approached scarcity of drinking-water will be greatly felt. I leave it to your readers to imagine the consequences of this grievous state of affairs. All hope, however, is not yet lost. If there be even a few inches of rain in December the evil day may be staved off.

Again, other parts of India, chiefly the Punjab and the North-West Provinces are partially affected by a deficient rainfall. Here, too, scarcity must soon be established altogether, therefore, the prospects for the coming year are hardly encouraging.

But these successive years of deficient rainfall emphasise the urgent necessity of adopting means whereby water may be supplied for agricultural purposes. Under the circumstances, it is somewhat gratifying to read of the appointment of an Irrigation Commission. It has not been appointed a day too soon. Sir Scott Moncrieff, of Egyptian fame, is the President, which gives us hope that we shall have about this time next year an elaborate and comprehensive report on practical lines. I have asked in these columns over and over again why the State could not put forth its best efforts to map out the whole country for purposes of artificial irrigation as they have so carefully mapped it out for railway construction. The large rivers might certainly be harnessed. If Sir Scott Moncrieff has so successfully accomplished the great work of impounding the waters of the Nile at Atbara and fertilising miles and miles of arid tracts in Egypt what is there to prevent our impounding the waters of almost all our large rivers in Northern and Southern India. Poor Sir Arthur Cotton strove might and main for forty years to get this single idea well impressed on the mind of the Government of India. From 1870 to the present time, we have borrowed at least 150 millions for railways. But what have these railways done so far as the "prevention" of famine is concerned? Next to nothing. It may be that grain from one tract to another has been carried, and that prices have been equalised. But that has not helped the Government to mitigate the horrors of famine. Neither has it helped to prevent famine anywhere. Now contrast this colossal expenditure on railways with what has been incurred on irrigation. How miserable is it. It dwindles into insignificance. But imagine what the condition of the country and the agriculturists might have been to-day had irrigation works of all kinds, small and great, inexpensive and costly, been constructed during the last 30 years, and the 150 millions spent on railways had been spent on these. No ghost is required to say that our recent famines might almost have been avoided. But such was the infatuation at head-quarters that irrigation works were considered secondary. It required two severest famines of the century, and the most potent and well-informed non-official criticism to rouse the Government from its lethargy and make it thoroughly alive to the importance of irrigation. But now that the initial step is taken and the country is to be surveyed and mapped out under the guidance of the most experienced and capable engineer whose labours in Egypt have been attended with such perfect success, let us hope it may be the glad harbinger of a brighter and happier day for our poor agriculturists. For this reason we all heartily welcome the Commission, and thank once more Lord Curzon for having taken this momentous step which is fraught, I repeat, with the happiest results to India in a few years to come. And let us all hope his Lordship may be long spared to witness the fruit of the policy he has now so courageously and considerately inaugurated.

CHRONICLE OF THE WEEK.

Thursday, October 17.—The Boer force under Commandant Maritz, which recently began a southward march from the Calvinia district, had now penetrated to Hopefield and Saldanha Bay. Its strength was stated to be only about 500, and according to a correspondent "its advance is infinitely less feared in military quarters than the possibility of its getting away." Saldanha Bay is about 60 miles from Cape Town.

The Simla correspondent of the "Times" stated that it was reported from Quetta that the news of the late Amir's death and Habibullah's accession reached Kandahar on October 11, and was received quietly. Rumours of restlessness among the Ghilzais and of the escape of Ayub Khan from Murree were unconfirmed. The correspondent furnished an account of two durbars held in Kabul subsequent to that at which Habibullah was formally accepted as Amir. The great officers and nobles swore allegiance to the new Amir on the Koran, and his brothers also declared that they accepted him as their Sovereign, and were confirmed in the offices they held under the late Amir.

Lord Rosebery was installed as High Steward of Kingston-on-Thames. The office was at one time held by Lord Liverpool, and in responding to an address from the Corporation, Lord Rosebery gave a sketch of that statesman's career. Incidentally he remarked that when a Minister who had exercised power or a predominant personality withdrew from public life he was apt to close the age in which he had played an important part, and was likely to be succeeded by a violent and even tumultuous change. That was the case with Lord Palmerston, and it was, in a different sense, the case with the retirement of Mr. Gladstone. In considering a career like Lord Liverpool's we should remem-

ber that the man himself seemed to constitute the period of politics which ended with his retirement, and that was why he (Lord Rosebery) always viewed with anxiety a long period of government undistinguished by domestic reform or any marked effort in that direction.

FRIDAY, October 18.—The concentration camps return for September was issued. The total number of inmates was 147,967, 109,418 being whites and 38,549 coloured people. The death-rate among the whites was about 264 per 1,000 per annum, or more than double the rate for June. The mortality was exceptionally heavy among the children, being at the rate of about 440 per 1,000 per annum.

The St. Petersburg correspondent of the "Times" stated that the Tsar had expressed his determination to do nothing calculated to provoke a conflict with regard to Afghanistan. If troubles arose it would not be the work of any one in St. Petersburg, but would be caused by the excess of zeal of some Russian official on the spot. The correspondent had reason to believe, however, that at the present moment Russia was in no way prepared to take the offensive in Afghanistan.

The "Cologne Gazette," in an article on the Baghdad Railway, argued that Koweyt was accounted Turkish territory, and said that it was not in the interest of Turkey or of those who build and work the railway that this important harbour should be alienated from the immediate sovereignty of the Sultan.

Lord Justice Collins was appointed Master of the Rolls in place of Sir A. L. Smith, resigned; and Mr. Justice Mathew was appointed a Lord Justice of Appeal in place of Lord Justice Collins.

SATURDAY, October 19.—Sir Wilfrid Lawson presided at the annual meeting of the North Cumberland Liberal Association. He remarked that for the last year or two, and even before the war, they had been living in a kind of backwash of Liberalism, but he thought that events which were occurring day by day were doing much to revive Liberal feeling in the country. As to the war, some thoroughly good Liberals looked upon it as justifiable. He maintained that the onus of proof lay upon them, and he thought Lord Rosebery, Mr. Asquith, Mr. Haldane, and Sir E. Grey would have a difficult task in proving that the burning of farms, the starving of children, the capturing of women, and the making of a hell upon earth in South Africa were in accordance with Liberal principles. But the atmosphere was clearing, and even those Liberals who believed that the war was forced upon us must be disgusted with the manner in which the Government had carried it on. They would all agree to work their hardest to get rid of a Government which had trailed the honour of England in the dust, and by its career of cruelty and crime had brought upon the country great disaster and disgrace.

Mr. John Redmond, M.P., addressed a United Irish League meeting at Maryborough, Queen's County. He expressed his satisfaction at the serious uneasiness and trouble which the province of Connaught was giving to Dublin Castle, and said he had noticed with the greatest possible gratification that Mr. Wyndham was showing an inclination to revive the methods of coercion. The League's policy was to make every department of government in Ireland difficult and dangerous, for if they wanted an instalment of justice they must make themselves a trouble and a danger to the Government. Crime and outrage did not make them dangerous to England. On the contrary, they played perfectly into the hands of their enemies and contributed a justification before the whole world for any repressive measures that might be adopted. But so long as they kept their hands unstained by anything in the nature of crime against the law of God—he did not speak of the law of the land, because most of it was bad and ought to be broken—and made their movement a power in Ireland and a continual danger to the English Government, they would have a chance of having some of their grievances remedied.

The "Manchester Guardian" wrote:—Two thousand seven hundred and twelve human beings perished during September in the camps into which they have been driven by our Government in South Africa. Of these the great majority, 2,411, were whites. The death-rate among the natives is still heavy, but, we are glad to see, slightly decreasing. But among the Boer population the rate is worse than that of a pestilence-stricken city. Among the children it reaches almost to the fabulous rate attributed to the Black Death in the fourteenth century, by which one-half of the population of this country was said to have been swept away in a year. If these camps are maintained without improvement for another eleven months, nearly one-half of the child population of the camps will have disappeared. To be more exact, if the actual number of deaths per month is maintained, we may expect that 23,568 children will die, a rate of 433 per thousand. It is, unfortunately, no unfair or unduly pessimistic inference that the rate will continue unchanged. Hitherto it has merely increased. In June there were altogether 777 deaths, in July 1,412, in August 1,878, in September 2,411.

MONDAY, October 21.—A despatch from Lord Kitchener gave the captures reported by the different columns since October 14. It also stated that the commandos brought into the Vryheid district by General Botha had now been driven back towards the Ermelo district, after their abortive attempt to raid Natal, while the local commandos all dispersed directly our columns got into touch with them. The despatch mentions that on Saturday last a patrol from Colonel Pilcher's column, south of the Thaba 'Nchu line in the Orange River Colony, was captured near Smithfield by some Boers dressed in khaki. Twelve more Boer leaders captured since September 15 had been permanently banished from South Africa. The most conspicuous name in the list was that of Commandant Scheepers.

Under the heading "Continental Anglophobia," the "Times" printed the following passage from the Austrian "Vaterland":—The Commander-in-Chief of the British troops in South Africa, in despair at not being able to conquer the Boers by honest war, has long had recourse to excessive brutality. Until recently a remnant of shame on the part of the English Government restrained the bloodthirstiness of Lord Kitchener, but since the beginning of this month he appears to have been allowed a free hand for every kind of inhumanity. A portion of the English Press feels the ineffaceable blemish which the infamies perpetrated by Lord Kitchener inflict on the name of England. It protests vigorously, but to no purpose. Other English organs openly applaud the executions, lifelong imprisonments, banishments, and floggings of which every day brings fresh tidings from South Africa. With that hypocrisy and mendacity which is only to be found in England, it is affirmed that such cruelty is necessary in order to save British lives, to put an end to the misery of thousands of families, and to convince the Boers, who regarded the generosity hitherto displayed by the English as mere weakness, that the British are masters in South Africa. All people who read the terrible accounts received last week and who hear that Louis Botha announced that the violence practised against his comrades would meet with reprisals at once understood that the inhuman conduct of Lord Kitchener did not inspire the Boers with fear, but with profound exasperation.

A Paris telegram stated that the Powers, acting on the initiative of France and Russia, were discussing "the bases of an understanding for making representations to the Porte and for eventually taking action in order to oblige the Sultan not only to carry out the Treaty of Berlin relating both to Macedonia and Armenia," but also to give guarantees for the execution of reforms and the settlement of pending questions. It was on this account, the telegram stated, there was good reason to believe that France had refrained from taking coercive measures against Turkey in respect to the Lorando and other claims.

Mr. P. A. M'Hugh, M.P., who had undergone six months' imprisonment for contempt of court in connexion with newspaper articles condemning jury-packing in Ireland, was released from Kilmainham gaol. The Lord Mayor of Dublin and representatives of other public bodies received him, and a public luncheon was given in his honour.

Sir A. L. Smith, who only a few days ago resigned the post of Master of the Rolls on the ground of ill-health, died last night in Morayshire. He was born in 1836, was appointed a Judge of the High Court in 1883, became a Lord Justice of Appeal in 1892, and succeeded Lord Lindley as Master of the Rolls last year.

The appointment of Mr. Joseph Walton, K.C., to be a Judge of the High Court in the room of Mr. Justice Mathew was officially announced.

TUESDAY, October 22.—It was announced that in consequence of the speech delivered by Sir Redvers Buller on October 10 the Commander-in-Chief, after full consideration of all the circumstances and of the explanations furnished by Sir Redvers Buller, had recommended that he be relieved of his command. He had accordingly been placed on half-pay. Major-General (local Lieutenant-General) Sir John French had been appointed to succeed Sir Redvers Buller in the command of the First Army Corps, the appointment to take effect when Sir J. French's services are no longer required in South Africa.

Mr. Haldane, M.P., delivered an address at Liverpool, under the auspices of the council and senate of Liverpool University College, on "The Function of a University in a Commercial City." He insisted on the imperative necessity of the systematic application of science to industrial undertakings if this country was to maintain her position in trade and manufactures, pointed out the extent to which this necessity had been recognised in Germany, and contended that thorough scientific training and research were the proper functions of the Universities that were being, or should be, established in our great commercial and industrial centres.

WEDNESDAY, October 23.—Lord Salisbury arrived in England on his return from France.

Mr. John Morley unveiled the Gladstone statue given to Manchester by the late Mr. William Roberts. At the base of the statue Mr. Morley spoke of Mr Gladstone as one of the truest patriots his country had ever boasted and as one who was not only a statesman but a transcendent orator, a great scholar, and a great teacher of the noblest lessons that nations could learn from those who ruled over them. Afterwards, in the Town Hall, Mr. Morley delivered an eloquent appreciation of the dead leader. He did not claim that Mr. Gladstone's career was immaculate from mistaken judgments, but held that to detract from Mr. Gladstone's greatness was a slur on those of his countrymen upon whose popularity he sailed for a longer period than a great leader of either party had ever enjoyed. Mr. Gladstone was one of the rare men who swept like some new planet across the skies and awakened, fascinated, and absorbed the attention of their age. In Parliamentary history no other orator had exhibited the same high level of supreme oratorical excellence in so many kinds. He was a prodigious worker. He did not take the House of Commons languidly, but honoured it and taught it to honour itself. It was not true to say that he always followed the flowing tide, but rather he was one who created and formed the public opinion on which he depended. If he had achieved nothing else, his inauguration in the Alabama arbitration of the first substantial precedent for substituting reason for force alone deserved lasting memorial. The country never suffered from weakness or indifference to its interests on his part. In his dealings with national finance there was the main key to their prosperity and wealth. The interests of the public, the necessity for improvement, and the necessity for thrift and vigilance imbued all that he did as head of the Administration. A great moral teacher, he always strove to bring considerations of truth and justice into the minds and hearts of his countrymen.

BRITISH RULE IN INDIA.

ADDRESS BY MR. NAOROJI AT BRIXTON.

[From Our Own Reporter.]

On Wednesday evening last, under the auspices of the Brixton Literary and Discussion Society, Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji delivered an address in the Lecture Hall of the Brixton Independent Church on the above subject. The pastor of the Church (the Rev. Bernard J. Snell) presided, and there was a very full attendance of members and friends.

Mr. Naoroji, who was received with cheers, said he thought the meeting would be more effective if he dealt with the subject concisely, and reserved himself to answer the debate at a later stage. The subject was a large one which could be treated in hundreds of aspects. He would, however, confine himself to one aspect only of the British Rule in India. Every Englishman and woman had a serious responsibility in regard to India, yet what was the material condition of that country? Had it been improved or spoilt under British rule? Unfortunately, from the outset the main principle which had characterised our rule in India had been self-gain irrespective of the oppression of the Natives—as the Court of Directors said in the early days of its existence:—"The vast fortunes acquired in the inland trade had been obtained by the most tyrannic oppressive conduct ever known in any age or country." Again, our connexion with India had been marked by a series of costly and bloody wars, the burden of which had been mainly borne by the Indians, and upon which the Indian Empire had grown up. Further, the Indians had had to bear the cost of administration while they had been deprived of any share or voice in the control, and simultaneously there was going on an enormous drain of Indian wealth to Great Britain which impoverished the country. The drain now represented thirty millions sterling annually; it was, as Sir Geo. Wingate said, "a cruel and crushing tribute," for as the taxes paid by the people of India were taken to a distant country, they in no way benefited from them. When the Mahommedans conquered a country they remained in it, and the produce of the country was not taken from it, but in the case of Great Britain and India the Europeans who drew the Indian revenues were merely like birds of passage, the wealth of the country was sent away from it, the land was consequently impoverished, the people became poorer and poorer, and hence the famines which so continually occurred. The Natives had no reserve, they lived merely from hand to mouth; they could not withstand bad harvests, and consequently things were going from bad to worse. What else could they expect under the circumstances? What would Englishmen think if they had been conquered by the French, and saw their national wealth thus being drained into France? Anglo-Indians, no doubt, represented that the state of India was very different to that described by him, but they were interested parties, and they ignored the real facts. Lord George Hamilton and others spoke of the recuperative powers of India, but, by the irony of fate, while such words were being used millions were dying from famine, and annually enormous numbers died of starvation, for they knew not what it was to have a full meal from year's end to year's end. When Germany defeated France and imposed an enormous indemnity the payment of that huge sum put an end to the trouble, and the French nation had an opportunity of recuperating; but in India it was different: the burden was a permanent one, and no chance of recuperation was afforded the people. Why should not the Natives have a share in the Government of their country? There ought to be no distinction of race, colour, or creed, and employment in his Majesty's service should be dependent solely on the merits of the individual. (Hear.) Although Proclamation after Proclamation had laid down that great principle, and had confirmed the promise of the Act of 1833 that the Indian people should be treated equally with all others of the subjects of the Sovereign, the responsible authorities had studiously ignored it and the Natives of India had been deprived of all share in the management of the affairs of the country. Subterfuges and hypocrisy had been resorted to in order not to fulfil the promises of the Act of 1833. As Lord Lytton had said: "the policy of the rulers had been to make promises to the ear and break them to the hope." This was a result of the unfortunate greed of the system of the Government, but he hoped it would not long continue to be a trait of the British character that its public men should thus continually break the solemn pledges and promises made to the people of India.

Mr. J. F. Spriggs, the hon. secretary of the Society, led the debate in opposition. He did not contest the narrative given by Mr. Naoroji of the woes of the people of India, but he claimed that the English Government in the 43 years it had been responsible for the administration of India, had enormously promoted its material prosperity. Life, honour, and property had been made secure for every Native; religious freedom had been granted, the country had been opened up by railways, roads had been made, and vast irrigation works had been carried out. He quoted Sir M. Bhownaggree's assertion that the Indian Natives were themselves largely responsible for their unfortunate position by reason of their opposition to the substitution of a sound system of technical education for the existing meretricious one, and he referred also to the large number of Natives who took part in municipal and local affairs, and to the number of Native judges and magistrates. As to famines, European administration had no doubt vastly mitigated loss of life and misery, and the terrible famine which had just been passed through, although the worst on record, had been attended with less terrible results than marked those which occurred under Native administration. Food, too, was cheap, for a Native could live on 2d. a day.

G. Kair Sing denied that Great Britain had any right to claim credit for the construction of railways in India; they were a necessary adjunct of modern development and they had been built with Indian money. The Natives, no doubt, now consumed more tobacco and whisky than formerly, but they were curses of India, and it was hardly wise for the British to claim credit as the last speaker had done for the large consumption of tobacco and the building of prisons. (Laughter.) Indian finance was in a most unsatisfactory condition, the much vaunted surpluses were secured solely by borrowings, and really the Indian Government was insolvent. They were, in fact, killing the hen that laid the golden egg. He denied that the Indians had any real voice in the government of their country. The large majority of the Natives who were on the Councils were nominated and not elective.

Mr. Naidu said that it was all very well to suggest that it only cost a Native 2d. a day to live, but look at the numbers who died of starvation! Was it likely that they left the 2d. at home and went out deliberately to starve? The fact that a Native could live on so little alone proved the poverty of India.

Mr. Mukerji also took part in the debate, declaring that the burden of their song was that the price paid by India for its connexion with Great Britain was too high. This had been admitted by eminent British statesmen. Indians were fully sensible of the benefit they had derived from English rule, but their case was that the price they were being made to pay for those blessings was rapidly ruining the country.

Mr. Naoroji, replying on the whole discussion, congratulated the audience on the nature of the debate. They had had well placed before them the Anglo-Indian view by Mr. Spriggs, who had out-Heroded Herod. (Laughter.) The English public, as represented by Mr. Spriggs, had always heard but one side from the beginning—the Anglo-Indian side. There was some justification for that as only recently had the other side been put before them by those who felt the pinch of the shoe. Mr. Spriggs had evidently not read both sides.

Mr. Spriggs: I have, I think, read everything published by Mr. Naoroji. (Laughter.)

Mr. Naoroji: But that did not appear in your remarks. (Renewed laughter.) He hoped those present would endeavour to read both sides of the case, and would secure the literature on each side. If they did that he believed they would soon see the fallacy of the Anglo-Indian arguments. It was not the case that wealth was being made in India now—except in one part; but it was the case that thousands were dying of starvation, and this was what had to be borne in mind. There had been no refutation of his statement that England had conquered India at India's expense, and was now drawing vast sums annually from it with the result that the country was becoming impoverished, and famines were increasing in number and severity. The taxation for famine relief fell upon India alone, and the voluntary subscriptions sent from this country represented an infinitesimal percentage of the wealth which England extracted from India. Had he made any statement which was not a fact? If he had not—and certainly no one had refuted him—then there was only one conclusion, and that was that India was the poorest country in the world. It had been deprived of all recuperative power, and taxation was being daily increased, although in an underhand manner. All he asked was for a fair and careful consideration of both sides of the question confidently in the belief that their verdict must be on his side.

The proceedings closed with the usual votes of thanks.

THE "DRAIN" FROM INDIA.

Lord George Hamilton recently had his attention drawn by a correspondent to a newspaper article which alleged that the distressed condition of the people of India was due to the "drain of thirty or forty millions from that country for which it gets no adequate return." The correspondent asked the Secretary for India whether the "drain" referred to did not, to a very great extent, consist of interest on money invested mainly by the British in railway and other beneficial enterprises in India, which have proved of incalculable benefit in times of famine. The following reply has been sent:—

"India Office, Whitehall, S.W., Oct. 18, 1901.

"Dear Sir,—In reply to your letter of the 15th inst., enclosing a newspaper cutting in regard to the expenditure in India and the condition of the peoples of that country, Lord George Hamilton asks me to say that the view of the position as indicated in the questions which you have put to him is substantially correct. The large annual expenditure on railways and other public works tends naturally to the development of the country and to the amelioration of the condition of the native population. Famine, as you say, is attributable to climatic conditions. Present prospects are favourable throughout the greater part of India; but official telegrams show that some anxiety has been caused by the failure of rain in the provinces lying towards the north-west.—Yours faithfully, "T. HASTINGS."

Commenting on this letter the "Morning Leader" wrote on Wednesday:—

We cannot congratulate Lord George Hamilton upon the letter he has written to an anonymous corespondent concerning the economic "drain" of at least thirty millions sterling per annum from India without equivalent return. The fact is not, as it cannot be, denied. It is indeed the fundamental fact of British Indian politics. But Lord G. Hamilton thinks it a sufficient answer to say that part of the tribute is for interest on railways and public works. That is true. But how if the railways involve the Indian taxpayers in loss, and the interest is paid mainly to investors in this country? And how if the railways fail in the task they were expected to discharge—the prevention of famine? But of course Lord G. Hamilton knows very well that the inequitable "home charges" account for much of the drain, and that the pensions to retired Anglo-Indians are a great burden upon the famine-stricken people of India. The Indian Civil Service is a wonderful service. But, as at present constituted, it is too costly for India, and the practical monopolisation of the higher offices by Englishmen deprives India of much wisdom, work, and wealth. India, said Lord Salisbury, "must be bled." The recurrence of famine with increasing intensity at intervals that grow shorter shows how far the bleeding has gone. Nobody needs to be told what the effects of this virtual tribute must be. As that distinguished Anglo-Indian officer, Sir George Wingate, said:—

> Taxes spent in the country from which they are raised are totally different in their effect from taxes raised in one country and spent in another. In the former the taxes collected from the population are again returned to the industrious classes. But the case is wholly different when the taxes are not spent in the country from which they are raised. They constitute an absolute loss and extinction of the whole amount withdrawn from the taxed country.

Moreover, as Mill showed, the obligation to make fixed and heavy payments abroad has the effect of placing a country at a disadvantage throughout its foreign trade. Lord G. Hamilton should look a little more deeply into the matter.

LOCOMOTIVES FOR INDIA.

THE BITTER CRY OF THE LITTLE ENGLANDER.

Lord George Hamilton has addressed the following communication to Mr. Baird, M.P., of Glasgow, who called his attention to the action of the Indian Government in placing a large order for locomotives in Germany:—

"India Office, Oct. 10.

"My dear Baird,—I was glad to receive your letter. I had been much concerned at the inability of our engineering firms to take up contracts for locomotives required in India, which, in consequence, have to be placed abroad. As you are so intimately by name and locale connected with the great steel and iron industries of Scotland, I am glad of an opportunity of writing fully to you upon the subject, as the loss of these contracts may become permanent unless strong measures are adopted by the trade to adjust and expand their powers of production so as to make them equal to the increasing demands which have and will be made upon them. It has for years past been the practice of the great railway companies in this country to build the great bulk of the locomotives they require from factories they themselves erect and control. Each railway company has its own type of locomotive, and each company constructs the great majority of the engines they so design. The outside firms get comparatively few orders from the home railways, and there is no standardisation of pattern or type in the limited orders they do receive.

"This two-fold uncertainty, first as to the orders they may get from the home railways, and secondly as to the type of locomotive they may be asked to build, has had a cramping effect upon the expansion of those engineering firms who construct locomotives. The demand for locomotives from India has greatly increased and will continue to increase. South Africa has also come into the home market recently with very large orders, and these orders in the aggregate are considerably in excess of what the home factories can produce. The Indian Government have had to postpone placing certain orders until the South African orders have been advanced. The rolling stock in India upon several of the great arterial lines is quite insufficient to carry the goods waiting to be moved, and these companies cannot indefinitely await execution of their pressing wants. The Assam-Bengal Railway, therefore, invited tenders for ten locomotives and the East Indian Railway for forty locomotives. The tenders from a Hanover firm were 25 per cent. less than any British firm, with delivery in about half the time. This difference in price and time can only be accounted for by the fact that the British firms were so full of work that they could only tender for more at prohibitive rates. Thus, the country has lost these contracts and a trade connexion with a foreign firm has been established to its detriment. From communications which have passed between me and certain leading firms, I am given to understand that if in India a standardisation of locomotives, such as exists in the United States and Canada, could be adopted, one element of uncertainty would be removed; and if, at the same time, a forecast in advance could be made of the number of locomotives required for the next year or a longer period, some of the obstacles now preventing an expansion of locomotive factories would be removed.

"In consultation with Lord Curzon I have directed a conference of Indian railway engineers to be held in December next at Calcutta, with a view of considering these objects, and the result of their deliberations will be published for the benefit of the trade. I hope, therefore, that if the Government move on their side for the purpose of retaining in this country railway orders from other parts of the Empire, the manufacturers will also on their side consider how they can add to the existing means of production; and that we shall thus in combination prevent for the future the placing of railway contracts abroad which ought to be retained here.—Believe me yours very truly,

"GEORGE HAMILTON."

On behalf of the home locomotive builders the following reply to Lord George Hamilton's statements on German contracts has been issued on behalf of one of the largest locomotive firms in Glasgow:—

"Lord George Hamilton has been lecturing the genial member of the Central division of Glasgow on the subject of British locomotive trade. Lord George says:—'The fact that most of the British railway companies build their own engines, and that in those the firms may be asked to build there is no standardisation, has had a cramping effect on the trade.' There is undoubtedly a great deal of truth in this statement of the Indian Secretary, and the present policy of our railway companies in manufacturing their own rolling stock is not only the most expensive system for themselves, but has done the greatest possible injury to the important industries affected thereby. How is it possible to obtain standardisation of the rolling stock on our railways when locomotive superintendents are appreciated and rewarded according to the amount of individuality or, as it too often is, the eccentricity displayed in the matter of design? Experience has shown that the locomotive manufacturer is the only safe medium of matured locomotive design and of economical manufacture; and it is just because this natural order is observed in the States that the locomotive trade in America has increased by leaps and bounds to the ultimate benefit in every direction of the railways in that country. In February, 1886, a locomotive builder raised a discussion in the Glasgow Chamber of Commerce upon this very subject—namely, railway companies as manufacturers of rolling stock; and the directors of a local company, in reply, stated that a railway company could build cheaper in their own shops than they could purchase from manufacturers, and that it did not matter where the plant was manufactured, as the same number of men would be employed. Now, no railway company can keep separate and correct costs of the building and repairing of rolling stock when new and repairing works are carried on, as at present, simultaneously in the same workshops. A manufacturer who devotes all his time and attention to one industry should surely be able to sell under the actual cost of producing similar work in the railway workshop, and this inclusive of a reasonable profit to himself. Further, railways are not yet independent of the condition of the general trade of the country, as the present alarming shrinkage in the returns of the goods traffic on all our railway systems indicates; and it should, therefore, be the policy of our railways to encourage in every possible way local industries. It is mainly because American locomotive manufacturers have been supported by continuous orders from their railway companies in the past that they are now so progressive, and able to undertake a large export trade. However, the greatest difficulty locomotive builders in this country have to contend with at the present is, not so much the want of standardisation or uniformity in design, as the exacting and unreasonable nature of the inspection to which most of their export work is subjected, and by which the output of their workshops is most seriously reduced. Quite a colony of consulting engineers in Westminster derive their incomes from the supervision of the contracts for bridges, permanent way, and rolling stock for our colonial and Indian railways, while a perfect army of inspectors, spread all over the country, live absolutely upon these contracts. Lord George Hamilton now proposes to have a conference in India in December on the subject of standardisation of types for the rolling stock to be ordered in future. As, however, the rolling stock on every line in India has been restricted in weight, etc., by the most stringent limitations, there is consequently at the present time not a single locomotive in all that vast country which could satisfy modern ideas as regards

dimensions and weight. In this respect the Cape Government railways have left India far behind, and their rolling stock manufactured in this country is quite up to modern practice, even in America. The proposed conference will, therefore, be much better employed in abrogating the obsolete Government weight limits now in force, or alternatively in standardising up the permanent way in India to modern requirements. If Lord George Hamilton was a permanent official and able and willing to guarantee that sufficient work would be forthcoming in the future, locomotive builders here would be quite willing to extend further their works to meet any possible demand, or they would be quite prepared to do so if the Government would guarantee, say, 5 per cent. on the additional expenditure for five years. It is, however, no occasion for panic or alarm that German builders, who are now passing through a most serious financial crisis—largely due to overproduction—with the added aid of protection in their own country, are able to underquote home manufacturers. No enlargement of productive capacity or possible conditions would enable locomotive builders in this country to compete successfully under such arrangements, and no manufacturer who desired to live would attempt to do so. Consulting engineers have been repeatedly warned in the annual trade reports of the congestion which was sure to result from the failure year after year of those in authority to order rolling stock for India when home manufacturers were working their shops on short time and a reduced staff. In Germany and America manufacturers have not as yet the Westminster engineers and their inspectors. As regards our home railways, there can be no appreciable standardisation in the permanent way tests for materials in the types for rolling stock until they are taken over by the State and controlled by one central authority. The output of our existing locomotive establishments could be at once doubled, without injuriously affecting the quality of the work produced, if the system of inspection were revised and brought more into harmony with that in vogue in America. A special expert commissioner has just visited the principal locomotive shops in America, and although he reports that he has been most favourably impressed with the superior intelligence, industry, and sobriety of the American workmen, he also states that there are no locomotive manufacturing establishments in the United States that can be classed or even compared with the leading locomotive shops in this country as regards equipment."

Messrs. Kerr, Stuart, and Co. (Limited), engineers and contractors, write from 20, Bucklersbury, E.C., under date October 22:—

Lord George Hamilton's letter published in the "Times" on the 18th inst. contains statements which made us address a letter to Sir A. M. Rendel, the engineer to the Indian Government.

We have to-day received his reply. This reply is a refusal on the part of the Indian Government either to allow us to build any of their locomotives, even when our tender is the lowest British tender received, or to give us any information as to what we can do to make our tenders for similar locomotives acceptable to them.

Unfortunately it has been the custom of late for those in highest authority to assume that English manufacturers are so busy that they cannot execute many of the orders required for India, the Cape, and other British possessions; but we do not remember that it has been suggested before that perhaps the authorities who make such statements have not taken sufficient steps to verify the accuracy of these statements. As far as our experience serves, we could unhesitatingly say that this is not so, and that we could during the last two years have increased our turnout considerably if we had received a portion of the orders placed abroad by the Indian Government or the Cape Government.

With regard to our tender for the Assam-Bengal Railway locomotives which Lord George Hamilton particularly mentions, ours was the lowest British tender received, and the time of delivery which we offered was, of the first engine in 30 weeks, and to complete the whole order in 46 weeks. The contract, however, Lord George Hamilton informs us was placed in Germany, because it could not be undertaken in England, and Lord George Hamilton continues:—"It was placed at 25 per cent. less price than any British firm offered, and for delivery in half the time." We deny the accuracy of the first statement with regard to his inability to get the contract undertaken in England, and challenge him to prove the other two statements with regard to price and time of delivery.

It may occur to you to ask how it is that in our letter to Sir Alexander Rendel we invite his inspection of some locomotives ordered as recently as September 15 and 25. The reason of this is that our own specifications were in these instances, to a very great extent, accepted, whereas the terms of the Indian Government specification compel the locomotive manufacturers to ask a longer time for the construction of these locomotives than for those built to any other specification that we know. Therefore, the time named by Lord George Hamilton that the Hanover firm required was "half that of any British manufacturer," which would bring it to 18 to 23 weeks, is quite impossible, unless this particular specification has been considerably altered, so as to render earlier delivery possible. If this has been done we should have had a similar opportunity.

It will be observed that we invite Sir A. M. Rendel to inform us what can be done in order to secure a portion of his orders. The locomotive orders placed by the Indian Government represent a large percentage of the total output from the private workshops in this country, yet, owing, doubtless, principally to the stringency of the specification, a very few of the locomotive manufacturers care to subject themselves to it. It would be interesting to know exactly how many of the British locomotive firms regularly build for the Indian Government, and the quantities manufactured of late years by each. It would also be interesting if Lord George Hamilton would state the terms of the contract made with the Hanover firm for the locomotives in question, and whether the specification under which these locomotives had to be built was modified.

We are aware that we are dealing now with one instance only, but we are prepared to produce others to show how British locomotive builders are being treated, and are being misled by such statements as those made use of in Lord George Hamilton's letter of the 18th inst. Other locomotive builders may not care, and it may not be politic for them to state their own particular grievances, but they one and all feel deeply that the vast orders for India are in the gift of one man, and if they cared to speak much valuable information against this system would be forthcoming. Whether other branches of engineering may have much to learn from our foreign competitors or not may be a question, but with regard to locomotives it is generally agreed that the English locomotive stands out pre-eminently first among its foreign competitors, more to-day than ever. In perhaps every other country of the world it obtains a preferential price. If there be any truth in Lord George Hamilton's complaint that the locomotive builders in this country will not increase their output sufficiently to deal with the Indian requirements, we can assure him that the energy of the locomotive builders in this country is quite sufficient to deal with the matter if he can assure them that such an outlay on their part will command a regular share of these contracts. Unfortunately the policy of the India Office is always to accept the lowest tender, whether British, American, or German, and after he has assured himself that the locomotive building resources of this country are really taxed to the utmost, he will find in this system his reply to the alleged shortness in supply of which he complains. We would also suggest that the system adopted by the India Office of supplying foreign locomotive builders with designs of locomotives in use in India be discontinued. Possibly the India Office may not get the best designs put into their locomotives, since the builders know they must provide detailed drawings, which (when the next contract for the same class of locomotive arrives) will be at the disposal of any foreign competitor who cares to take the trouble to copy them.

THE FAMINE IN INDIA.

254,000 ON RELIEF.

The Secretary of State for India has received the following telegram from the Viceroy, dated October 21:—

As a consequence of cyclonic storm there has been good rain in Bengal, Orissa, Central Provinces (East), Haidarabad; beneficial showers Berar, North Deccan, Gujerat. Prospects have improved in Rajputana by substantial but scattered falls, but outturn of autumn crops will be bad throughout Gujerat, Malwa, Bhopawar, and Rajputana. In Ajmere and Punjab they have mostly failed on unirrigated land, and rabi sowings will be very short should no rain fall within next fortnight. In north Central Provinces rice has failed, and here also rabi area will be much below the average. Elsewhere prospects fair to good. No marked fluctuation in prices generally, but fallen substantially Ahmednagar. Reduction continues in number on relief works in Bombay. Numbers in receipt of relief:—Bombay, 202,000; Bombay Native States, 22,000; Baroda, 27,000; Haidarabad, 1,000; Mysore, 2,000. Total, 254,000.

THE DISMISSAL OF MR. PENNELL.

HIS REPLY TO HIS OFFICIAL ACCUSERS.

(*Continued from page* 191.)

He told me Sir Francis Maclean had sent him for the record, and showed me an autograph letter from Sir Francis Maclean directing him to get it from me. I held out my hand for the letter, but he kept it to himself, and said he was not supposed to show it to me. He allowed me, however, to read it, keeping it in his own hands. . . . . The letter was on the High Court's demi-official notepaper, it began: "My dear Chapman," and ended "Yours sincerely, F. W. Maclean," and was in the same handwriting as the letter subsequently handed to me at the Chief Justice's house.

I asked Mr. Chapman if it were not rather irregular that I should make over a record, especially an important record, in this way, and pointed out to him that forms were really of great importance in our law. I referred to a book—Hearn's "Government of England"—which I had studied when reading for the Law School at Oxford, and told him the whole gist of that book was the way in which the nominal powers of the King's Ministers, Courts, etc., were circumscribed and limited by the necessity of observing forms.

I may explain that I took this line of argument because I did not want Mr. Chapman, whom I regarded as a friend of mine, to think that I was raising frivolous objections—and thought that

to a man like Mr. Chapman, who, I believe, knows no more law than the very small modicum required for the Departmental Examinations, it might appear quite sufficient that the Chief Justice had need of the record.

To his Lordship, however, I need make no scruple of submitting (as I have already submitted in para. 6 of my first memorial), "that Sir Francis Maclean, or the Chief Justice of Bengal (if it be assumed that he was acting officially), has no power to send for records in this way, and that his action was both illegal and improper." I may add that even if Sir Francis Maclean had been a member of the Criminal Bench—which he was not—he could only have called for the record legally with the concurrence of the other member of that Bench, and with the use of the High Court's seal—with forms which ensured that very publicity which he was so anxious to avoid.

Mr. Chapman seemed impressed with my arguments, and admitted the fact—an additional matter of suspicion—that he was no longer Registrar. He said that he had made over charge to Mr. Sheepshanks, and was on leave, though he had remained in Calcutta a few days at the Chief Justice's request "to do odd jobs." The fact that Mr. Chapman had ceased to be Registrar was, I may say, known to me before, but in fairness to him I should here state that he volunteered it. . . . . I told Mr. Chapman I had no objection to showing him the record, which was lying loose in a box of mine, and that, indeed, I should like to show him some of the Exhibits, as the more people saw them before they passed out of my hands the better it would be for me. He said that he believed Ex. X 28, was in Major Strachey's handwriting, but added—like Moulvi Zakir Husain in the Chupra case—that he did not know Major Strachey's handwriting well. He admitted (with reference to Exhibit X 32) that he knew Mr. Bolton's handwriting well. Finally, he suggested that if I did not care to make over the record to him, I should take it to the Chief Justice's house and make it over to the Chief Justice myself. I said that before doing anything I would consult Mr. P. L. Roy, who, I may say, has the largest criminal practice in Calcutta, was formerly Legal Remembrancer to the Bengal Government, and had for many years been a very intimate friend of mine. And Mr. Chapman and I agreed together that I should be taken to have told him that I would consult Mr. P. L. Roy before giving him a final answer. Mr. Chapman then went away. I submit that it is probable he went to the Chief Justice, or at all events informed him what had happened. That he made no secret of the fact that I had shown him the record will appear from the "proceeding" issued by the Criminal Bench the next day. It is not unlikely, however, that he kept back from the Chief Justice his own suggestion that I should bring the record in person. Soon after Mr. Chapman left, I went to Mr. P. L. Roy, and consulted him as to Mr. Chapman's suggestion. He advised me to go at once to Sir Francis Maclean, and make over the record to him—he did not think, he said, that anyone could blame me for doing so, as even though the Chief Justice's action was informal, still he was the highest judicial authority in the country.

Whatever may be thought of the merits of this advice, I decided to act upon it. If any excuse be held necessary, I would submit that I did not see then a great many things which I see now. It was to my interest that the Chief Justice should be impartial in the Reily case, and it was natural, therefore, I should be slow to believe the contrary. By sending me the telegram of the 17th February, the Chief Justice had placed himself to a certain extent in my hands; and though Mr. Chapman's procedure was certainly somewhat mystifying, the mystery might, for all I know, have been imported by himself, while there was apparent good faith in his suggestion that I should make over the record personally. Moreover, I was inclined to attach great weight to Mr. Roy's advice; and he said that my taking Sir Francis Maclean the records, however informally he had expressed his wish for them, would please the Chief Justice and get him on my side.

I accordingly returned to my hotel, and thence proceeded with the records to Sir F. Maclean's house, 14, Loudon Street, accompanied by my Sheristadar, Sessions Clerk, and a peon. I arrived about 3 p.m. and sent in my card.

I may say that I was about the last person in the world to force myself upon Sir Francis Maclean if I had thought for a moment that he did not desire my presence. Except that I once went to see Mr. Justice Sale about the Chupra case in 1899, I have never called upon any European High Court Judge—and, indeed, I do not think I have paid half a dozen calls on any one in Calcutta since 1889. . . . . I went to Sir F. Maclean's house under the impression that he was fully prepared for my coming, and was expecting and indeed desiring to see me. And for this reason I sent in my card in the first instance without any message.

The Chief Justice's servant took in the card and returned with the answer "darwaya bund," literally "door closed," a phrase corresponding to our English "not at home," only that, unlike the latter phrase, it does not suggest that the recipient of the call is out. I thought there must be some mistake: that Sir F. Maclean might be "out" to ordinary visitors but that he would at least be "at home" to me, if he knew who I was and what I had come about. I therefore asked for my card back, intending to write on it. I may say it was the only card I had with me on which my service and address were given.

The servant went upstairs, but after a good time returned and told me I could not have my card back. He added that the Sahib (his master) had guests at tiffin (luncheon).

This only made me the more convinced that there was some mistake. I thought the servant had not given his master the card, fearing the master's anger at being disturbed—and did not want the fact to come out. I searched and found another card on which my name only was printed, and wrote on the back of it, "I understand from Mr. Chapman that you want record. When can you see me?" I told the servant to give that card to his master and bring an answer.

The man went upstairs and re-appeared. There was a very long delay. I grew impatient and told the man I was not going to wait there all day. There were more disappearances and reappearances. At length it was announced the Sahib was writing an answer. Finally, I was handed a letter in Sir Francis Maclean's handwriting: "That Chief Justice of Bengal is unable to see Mr. Pennell, and desires that any communication he may wish to make should be made through the Registrar of this Court."

The explanation which I suggest of these occurrences to his lordship is the same as I submitted in my memorial of the 21st March. . . . . If Mr. Chapman conveyed to him my message, he must have been aware that at least one responsible person besides myself would know of his getting the record. . . . . This was very different to my making over the record to a private go-between without having a scrap of paper to show for it!

From Sir Francis Maclean's house I drove straight to Mr. P. L. Roy's, which is close to it. I found closeted with Mr. Roy Babu Moti Las Ghose, the editor of the "Amrita Bazar Patrika." I told them both what had happened.

From Mr. P. L. Roy's I returned to my hotel, where I found awaiting me a letter from Mr. Chapman (enclosure). This letter shows, I submit, that Mr. Chapman was aware of the orders which Government were about to issue: and as he had said nothing of the matter when he was at my hotel, he was presumably ignorant of their resolve then. I submit that this makes it probable that the resolution itself was taken between his visit to my hotel and the time of my return there—between, say 1 and 4.30—and that it was taken in consequence of his failure. I would further submit that it is not an altogether improbable supposition that it was taken at the Chief Justice's house. Sir Francis Maclean is not, I would submit, likely to have forgotten who were his guests that day; and it is in his Lordship's power to question him upon the subject.

I would further point out in justice to myself that it is not I but Mr. Chapman who mixes up private and official matters. Who in the world, I submit to his lordship, would trouble about an invitation to dinner in the case put by Mr. Chapman?

The reply I sent that gentleman was that my sister and I did not wish to compromise him, and that we should like him to say if he would prefer we did not dine with him.

Mr. Chapman replied by renewing his invitation (enclosure), and we accordingly dined with him.

Just before we started to dine with him I got the letter which is the Bengal Government's Enclosure No. 33 X conveying the Lieutenant-Governor's order "that you leave Calcutta at once and return to your Station, Noakhali," and requesting "that you will be so good as to report the exact day and time at which you leave Calcutta and arrive at Noakhali." As pointed out by me in para. 10 of my second memorial, to comply with this order would have left me no option but to take away the record with me—while from the Chief Justice's letter which Mr. Chapman had produced it was clear that he wanted it at once. I determined therefore to apply by official letter to Mr. Sheepshanks, who was then Registrar, as directed by the Chief Justice, and to support the letter if possible by a statement from Mr. Chapman—who I thought had got me into trouble—to show that I was not really to blame, and had not intended any offence to the Chief Justice.

I did not care to discuss the subject at the dinner table, but arranged with Mr. Chapman to come to his house and see him the first thing next morning (the 4th March). Accordingly, that morning I went to his house. . . . . I told him what had happened at the Chief Justice's house, and said it looked very much as though the Chief Justice meant to disown him. I pointed out that he had got me into great difficulty, and asked him to give me a statement in writing of what had taken place between us on the preceding morning, or so much of it as he cared to admit. He asked me if I meant to use the statement. I said certainly: that was what I wanted it for. He suggested that he could make a note for himself so that he could refresh his memory if necessary. I said that would not serve my purpose. Finally, Mr. Chapman declined to give me any statement in writing: he did not think, he said, that he was "called upon" to give me any such statement. . . . .

The Bengal Government in forwarding the memorial which contains my allegations as to the events of the 3rd March, states that "the circumstances are not within the cognizance of this Government." But Mr. Chapman was and is their own subordinate—at the time their letter was written he was living in Calcutta, where he was employed as Additional Judge of Alipur. They could easily have examined him: they would have examined him if they had thought there was any chance of his contradicting my statements. His lordship can examine him or compel his examination now. I by no means wish my statements either on this or on any other point to be accepted without investigation: but I submit that it is not an unreasonable request that if those statements are not admitted, I should be afforded reasonable facilities for proving them.

I informed Mr. P. L. Roy of Mr. Chapman's refusal, and decided to file in support of my letter to the Registrar affidavits by my sister as to Mr. Chapman's visit and by my clerks as to the occurrences at the Chief Justice's.

I got these affidavits drafted and went with my sister and the two clerks to the High Court between 11 and 12 a.m. The events which followed are set forth in sufficient detail in para. 10 of my memorial of the 29th April, the statements in which neither the Bengal Government nor the Government of India have ventured to traverse.

(*To be continued.*)

NOW READY, AT ALL BOOKSELLERS AND LIBRARIES.

Rudyard Kipling's

NEW BOOK,

KIM.

ILLUSTRATED BY J. LOCKWOOD KIPLING. CROWN 8vo, **6s.**

MACMILLAN AND CO., LTD., LONDON.

PUBLICATIONS RELATING TO INDIA.

To be obtained from
THE BRITISH COMMITTEE OF THE INDIAN NATIONAL CONGRESS, 84-85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, S.W.

Reports of the Proceedings at the Annual Sessions of the Indian National Congress, from the 3rd to the 14th Session. 2s. each, post free.

The Skeleton at the (Jubilee) Feast (Congress Green Book I.), by Sir WILLIAM WEDDERBURN, Bart. (being a series of suggestions for the prevention of famine in India). Post free, 7d.

Royal Commission on Indian Expenditure: Evidence-in-Chief of the Indian Witnesses. (Congress Green Book II.) Post free, 1s. 10d.

The Proposed Separation of Judicial and Executive Functions in India. Memorial to the Secretary of State. With two Appendices. (Congress Green Book III.) Post free, 1s. 2d.

Two Statements presented to the Indian Currency Committee (1898), by Mr. DADABHAI NAOROJI.

Speech by Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, M.P., in the House of Commons, August 14, 1894, on the Debate on the Indian Budget.

Ditto do. in the House of Commons, February 12, 1895, on the Debate on the Address.

Ditto do. on British Rule in India (1898).

Presidential Address by Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, M.P., delivered to the Indian National Congress at Lahore, 1893.

Presidential Address by Mr. A. M. Bose, M.A., delivered to the Indian National Congress at Madras, 1898.

Speeches of Mr. Alfred Webb, M.P., President of the Indian National Congress, 1894-5.

Valedictory Address of Mr. Alfred Webb, M.P., delivered at Bombay, January 17, 1895.

Speeches of Mr. D. E. Wacha delivered at the 9th, 11th and 14th Sessions of the Indian National Congress.

Is the Government of India Responsible to Anyone, and if so to Whom? Speech delivered at Croydon by Mr. W. C. BONNERJEE.

The Famine in India. Speeches delivered at a Public Reception to Mr. Vaughan Nash on his return from the Famine Districts, July, 1900.

Mr. A. O. Hume's Farewell to India. Speech delivered at Bombay, 1894.

India Reform Pamphlet IX. The State and Government of India under its Native Rulers. 3d.

The Indian National Congress: its Aims and Justification. By ROBERT KNIGHT.

Indian Famines: Their Causes and Remedies. By PRITHWIS CH. ROY. Post Free, 1s. 1d.

A Needed Reform in the Indian Administration, by ROMESH C. DUTT, C.I.E.

The Bogey of a Russian Invasion. A Lesson from the Tirah Campaign, by Col. H. B. HANNA.

The High Courts and the Collector-Magistrates in India, by J. DACOSTA.

The Government of India and its Reform through Parliamentary Institutions, by J. DACOSTA.

Note on Sir J. Westland's Budget, 1894-5.

Note on the Explanatory Memorandum of the Secretary of State for India, 1894-5.

Note on Sir James Westland's Budget, 1895-6.

Note on Sir H. Waterfield's Tables, 1884-5 to 1894-5.

The Poor Man's Lamb: Famine Insurance for the Masses *versus* Exchange Compensation for the Classes.

REPRINTS FROM "INDIA."

The Judiciary and the Executive in India. Interview with Mr. Manomohan Ghose.

The Bombay Government and Higher Education, by the Hon. C. H. Setalved.

A National Famine Grant, Letter from the London Indian Society to Lord Salisbury, 1900.

India and the General Election (1900).

"Melancholy Meanness."

The "Over-population" Fallacy Again.

No National Contribution?

The "Slimness" of the India Office.

"Mainly a Question of Money."

A Selection of the Publications enumerated above will be forwarded to responsible persons or Associations in the United Kingdom for gratuitous distribution, on written application to the British Committee, Indian National Congress, 84-85, Palace Chambers, Westminster, S.W.

is what its name implies

FEVER DESTROYER

and Cures Malarious, Intermittent and Remittent types of Fevers, Colds, etc.

North Raglan Barracks, Devonport.
I beg to enclose a cheque for the "Jvara-Hari." Both in India and Africa I have found it the BEST REMEDY FOR FEVER I know.
C. E. WOOD, Capt. 22nd North Staffs. Regt.

"Jvara-Hari" is so efficacious on all fevers, that I now indent upon you for 4 dozen, per value payable parcel. I think there is more than magic in it.
G. L. NARSINGA ROW

For INDIGESTION, DIARRHŒA, CHOLERA, etc., etc.

Cuddalore Municipal Councillors' Office.—"I have much pleasure in stating that your 'Omum-Carpoor' was found very useful for Cholera if taken in the early stage.
C. S. SRINIVASA, Chairman

Prices of "JVARA-HARI" and "OMUM CARPOOR" 8 ans., Rs. 1/8 Rs., 2/12 Rs., & 11 Rs per bottle. N.B.—1 doz. sent post free. To be had of all Chemists and Dealers, or of the Proprietors,

Omum-Carpoor
TRADE MARK

HENRY'S GREAT INDIAN REMEDIES COMPANY,
43, KING WILLIAM STREET, LONDON, E.C., AND
27 SECOND LINE BEACH, MADRAS.

LEGAL EDUCATION IN ENGLAND.

Full particulars of the course of study and of the cost of living, etc., etc., will be forwarded on the receipt of 8 one anna stamps, by Mr. J. M. PARIKH,

1, CLOISTERS, TEMPLE, LONDON, E.C.

The annual subscription to INDIA (post free) is nine shilling for England and six rupees for India. Subscriptions are payable in advance. Remittances, or communications relating to subscriptions or any other matter of business connected with INDIA, should in all cases be sent to the MANAGER *of INDIA 84 and 85, Palace Chambers, Westminster, London, S.W. In any communication regarding copies of INDIA circulated in India, it is requested that Subscribers be referred to both by name and by the number printed in each case upon the addressed wrapper.*

Subscription in England :—
October 1 to End of Year (Post free), 2s. 8d.

Cheques and Post Office Orders payable to W. DOUGLAS HALL.

Copies of INDIA can be obtained from the Offices of the Paper; from MR. ELLIOT STOCK, *Paternoster Row, London, E.C.; and to order at any Railway Bookstall.*

Printed by A. BONNER, 1 & 2 Took's Court, London, E.C., and Published for the Proprietors at 84 and 85, Palace Chambers, Westminster, S.W.